

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Michael R. Krause et al.

Serial No.: 09/980,759

Filed: April 11, 2002

Docket No.: 10002164-2

Title: RELIABLE DATAGRAM TRANSPORT SERVICE

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 15, 2005. Claims 1-20 were rejected. With this Response, claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Request for Comment 793, Transmission Control Protocol (Sept. 1981) (RFC 793) reference.

The RFC 793 reference does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 of a first end-to-end context at the source endnode and the first destination endnode storing state information to ensure the reception and sequencing of message data sent from the source endnode to the first destination endnode thereby facilitating reliable datagram service between the source process and the first and second destination processes, and a second end-to-end context at the source endnode and the second destination endnode storing state information to ensure the reception and sequencing of message data sent from the source endnode to the second destination endnode thereby facilitating reliable datagram service between the source process and the third destination process.

The RFC 793 reference also does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 11 of storing state information in a second end-to-end context at the source endnode and the second destination endnode to ensure the reception and sequencing of message data sent from the source endnode to the second destination endnode, sending message data via the reliable datagram service between the source process and the first and second destination processes, wherein the reliable datagram service is controlled by the state information stored in the first end-to-end context, and sending message data via the reliable datagram service between the source process and the third destination process, wherein the reliable datagram service is controlled by the state information stored in the second end-to-end context.

By contrast, the RFC 793 reference teaches the transmission control protocol (TCP) which employs a reliable connection service between two processes. A similar reliable connection service to communicate between distributed processes is illustrated in Figure 3 and described from page 12, line 15-page 14, line 5 of the Present Specification. The TCP reliable connection service and the reliable connection service described and illustrated in the Present Specification both require an association of a local send buffer or queue and receive buffer or queue (i.e., queue pair (QP)) with one and only one remote QP. In a reliable connection service a non-sharable resource connection must be established between a source process and a destination process. The connection establishment and clearing of the TCP reliable connection service is described in Section 2.7, beginning at page 10 of the RFC 793 reference, which states that a connection is fully specified by the pair of sockets at the ends, and the connection can be used to carry data in both directions, that is, it is full duplex.

A reliable connection service, such as disclosed in the RFC 793 reference and disclosed in the Present Specification, requires a process to create a QP for each process which it is to communicate with over a network.

Instead, the distributed computer system of amended independent claim 1 and the method of sending message data via a reliable datagram service of amended independent claim 11 employ a first end-to-end context at the source endnode and the first destination endnode and a second end-to-end context at the source endnode and the second destination endnode to store state information to ensure the reception and sequencing of message data sent from the source endnode to the respective first and second destination endnode nodes to thereby facilitate reliable datagram service between the source process and the first, second, and third destination processes. Thus, the end-to-end contexts defined in amended independent claim 1 and amended independent claim 11 only require the source process to have one send work queue (instead of three send work queues as would be required by the reliable connection service disclosed in the RFC 793 reference) to have reliable datagram service between the source process and the first, second, and third destination processes.

Therefore, the RFC 793 reference does not teach or suggest the distributed computer system of amended independent claim 1 or the method of amended independent claim 11. In addition, dependent claims 2-10 further define patentably distinct independent claim 1, and

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Michael R. Krause et al.

Serial No.: 09/980,759

Filed: April 11, 2002

Docket No.: 10002164-2

Title: RELIABLE DATAGRAM TRANSPORT SERVICE

dependent claims 12-20 further define patentably distinct independent claim 11. Therefore, dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 are also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection to claims 1-20, and request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Michael R. Krause et al.

Serial No.: 09/980,759

Filed: April 11, 2002

Docket No.: 10002164-2

Title: RELIABLE DATAGRAM TRANSPORT SERVICE

Any inquiry regarding this Response should be directed to either Patrick G. Billig at Telephone No. (612) 573-2003, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or William J. Streeter at Telephone No. (970) 898-3886, Facsimile No. (970) 898-7247. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Michael R. Krause et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2003
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 9-15-05

PGB:cmj



Patrick G. Billig

Reg. No. 38,080

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 15 day of September, 2005.

By 

Name: Patrick G. Billig